

# The Republican.

No. 17, Vol. I.] LONDON, FRIDAY, DEC. 17, 1819. [PRICE, 2D.

## A LETTER TO THE OPPOSITION LORDS OF THE PRESENT PARLIAMENT.

From the bottom of my soul I hate  
Despotic kings, and ministers of state.

*Swift.*

MY LORDS,

The voice of the bold but untitled citizen is seldom attended to amidst the clamour of faction, or the roar of anarchy. Nothing but the terrific clarion of ambition can make itself heard—nothing is felt but the irresistible impulse of power—the advocates of liberty, and truth, and justice, are thrust into the back ground, while the blood-stained tools of despotism rush upon the stage. What can be a more heart-rending sight, my lords, than a nation which has once been free, trembling at the nod of a tyrant? while myriads of his mercenary and villainous troops traverse the country, insult and massacre the peaceable inhabitants, and stand prepared to commit any atrocity which their masters may command? Oh! 'tis a spectacle horrid and detestable in the extreme—a spectacle that awakens every martial feeling in the soul of the patriot, that nerves his arm to prepare for the conflict, in which he is to combat for all those rights and all those privileges which are dear to the human heart—which entitle him to the proud appellation of a free citizen; to the rights of humanity; to every thing that is valuable, and great, and noble in man. Ah! my lords! can you blame us for clinging round those sacred rights—our household gods! Can you look on with apathy while we are deprived of our dear-bought, adored LIBERTY? Can you behold us pale and melancholy, weeping near the dying embers of our dreary fire-sides, over some small portion of

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield

the statue of liberty, which we had the courage to preserve, when the colossal mass itself was dashed to pieces by the barbarous sacrilegious axe of despotism; *can* you behold this, my lords, and your hearts not sicken at the sight? No; though rich and powerful, and far removed from those distresses which gradually sink your fellow-citizens to the grave, you are still MEN—*still* ENGLISHMEN—and the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM! And should the ministry actually abridge the liberties of the English nation, my lords, the *only* course you can pursue with honour is, to *impeach them for high treason*, and secede from the house. This, my lords, is not a rash or visionary scheme; it is the clear dictates of a steady reflecting mind—of a mind that places all its happiness in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and which would spurn existence itself, were its exertions confined by the bloody mace of despotism.

Earl Grey, one of the most honourable of your members, has laid it down as an axiom, that “*where* great discontent prevails, *there* likewise must have been great misgovernment.” This is a truth, my lords, that deserves to be written in letters of gold, and what immediately follows is *nearly* as excellent: “there were no people so ferocious, (said the noble lord,) and least of all could such a character be attributed to the *people* of England, as to turn on their benefactors, tear to pieces all authority, and destroy even the means of their own security. If, however, the *people* were seen to act in any respect like this, must it not have proceeded from the operation of great distress and severe sufferings?” Yes, my lords, and the suffering must be extreme that can ever induce the peaceable inhabitants of this country to take up arms against their oppressors. ’Tis vain to imagine that seditious writers, or seditious speakers can excite the people to rebellion when they have bread to eat, and the liberty to eat that bread in peace: *the people are not fond of civil war*; they dread its consequences, and deprecate its woes: but *only so long as they have bread*—when that period is at an end, they think that nothing more terrible can befall them, even amidst the horrors of civil war; and they will be sure to know when they are in a *state of starvation*, whether public orators, or political writers, tell them so or not. You must be very sensible of these truths, my lords, and the ministry, stupid as it is, cannot be ignorant of them. But



they shut their eyes, and will not behold the truth; they know that the more enlightened the people are, the more impatient of servitude they will be, and they single out the man who instructs them for destruction, under pretence of punishing *libellers*; but the trick is too stale to succeed much longer; mankind are not so blind but that they can distinguish their friends from their foes. Tyrants may rail at free-thinking, call a republican a rebel, and a philosopher an atheist, but the people will always think *that* government the best which procures them the greatest portion of liberty, and those opinions and principles the most pure whose professors are the least tainted with the vice of *persecution*.

My sentiments on religion are very free—on government, still freer; but my principles are such as I can defend without subjecting myself to the imputation of irreligion or rebellion; the man who believes in one God, cannot be irreligious, and a man who is the enlightened advocate of liberty, cannot be a rebel. Coolly and impartially reviewing the subject, how can the government accuse us of blasphemy or sedition; how can they say we are wanting to plunge the country into all the woes of anarchy, when we labour to impress the public mind with the respect which is due to the sage, the patriot, and the hero? But if we pay no respect to knavery, however high it may stand, if we do not bow down before *vice* and *imbecillity*, **WHATEVER TITLE IT MAY WEAR**, it is because nature has not taught us to play the hypocrite, or to *affect* to reverence those characters which we despise.

Much has been said, and much may yet be said, by those who have more words than ideas, about the illegality of popular meetings. The Earl of Carysfort, adverting to the Manchester meeting of the 16th of August, where the people were massacred by the yeomanry cavalry, asks—"Was it possible that it could be lawful for men to meet in such enormous numbers, and in a threatening manner, as on that occasion, and that a proceeding could be lawful which goes to defeat all the ends for which men enter into society?" I know not whether the noble earl has, or has not weighed, with the precision becoming a statesman, the real motives which impel men to enter into society; but this I know, that if he has, he talks very ridiculously and vaguely about them. I will quote his own words:—"Men (says he)

entered into society for the purpose of *leaving the protection of their rights* to PUBLIC AUTHORITIES instituted for that purpose, and not to "the adjudication of themselves."

"Fine words—I wonder where you stole 'em!"

Swift.

My lords, were you not obliged to hold your sides while the Boeotian nobleman was talking this fine logic to you? were you not very much inclined to laugh; did ever your politeness put a more provoking restraint upon your inclination than at that moment? To hear a gentleman, a nobleman, a statesman, talk of men entering into society "for the purpose of *leaving the protection of their rights*" to any "*constituted authorities*" whatever, is so supremely ludicrous, that it would have forced a smile upon the face even of Trophonius himself, though at the very moment he was coming out of his cave. But if his lordship is really ignorant of the motives which induced men to enter into society, at first, I will take upon me, ignorant as I am, to instruct him. Men entered into society that, by uniting their strength, they might be able to resist the attacks of savage and ferocious animals by which they were surrounded. When many of these societies were formed, they found it necessary in *one clan* to guard against the attacks of its neighbour, more injurious, and more sanguinary, than those of the most savage beasts. This cemented the union which chance had formed. When peace succeeded to the horrors of war, men of calm and mild natures wore off by degrees the asperity of the martial character, and sunk into the agriculturist and the peaceful citizen. But as there always will be some villains amongst the best of men, it was found necessary that the *general will* should be made known with regard to certain actions, which were, when disapproved by the society, denominated crimes. The man who possessed the clearest understanding and the most unblemished character was chosen by the people to be the arbiter of their quarrels. The man who was most expert at making up private quarrels, must be the most proper to conciliate a neighbouring clan, with whom they might be by chance at variance—he was constituted the representative of the people, and endued with the power of making peace or war. He executed his commission to their satisfaction—they intrust him with all their public affairs. He is unequal to the task; but as every



human being is fond of power, he would not refuse the honour, but determined to associate with himself those about him whom he observed to be the most docile and expert." Such is the origin of society—where we see that men, far from entering into society for the purpose of giving up their rights, only did so for the obviating of some physical evil which they could not otherwise avoid—and such is the origin of tyrants and their ministers.

In addition to this most curious doctrine on the origin of society, his lordship assured the house that the present times were different from the civil wars, when there *was a claim of arbitrary power in the crown*, and a contest on the part of the people *for the recovery of ancient rights and liberties*. Those liberties were now well understood, and he was convinced that none were ever more attached to those principles than the *illustrious* royal family under whose auspices we live. The king undertakes to administer justice in mercy, and so mild has been his reign, that in the performance of this duty, numerous cases have occurred in which mercy may be thought to have been carried too far. What would have been said at the time of the REVOLUTION, by the judges of that day, had a grand jury been abused in public libels, as the grand jury of Lancashire have been treated *for doing their duty*.

The noble earl acknowledges, though rather unwillingly, that we understand what our liberties are—he is right; we do understand what liberty means, in spite of him and his co-partners, who wish to deprive us of our only mode of information. But how, in the name of humanity, could you, my lords, sit down patiently while such a doctrine as this was preached to you? How could you hear him pronounce that mercy had been carried too far, and not interrupt him in his impious harangue? Ah! my lords, you are too tame; you only display half of the patriot's character; you *suffer* when you ought to *act*; you daily hear the majesty of the people insulted; you hear them sneered at; you see their petitions scorned, their remonstrances slighted, their miseries disregarded—and yet you do not step forward and espouse their cause warmly! What, my lords, can have caused this indifference, this criminal apathy, this *more than christian* patience? I fear, that the scare-crow set up by the supporters of despotism, has alarmed even you. I fear that the idea that the people have imbibed the Quixotic doctrine of an equality

of property, has found its way into your minds. But if such are your fears, if such are your apprehensions, my lords, I believe I may venture to assure you, that your fears and apprehensions are perfectly unfounded. The people want nothing but a fair and equal representation; and a government whose expenses are as contracted as possible, and whether you call it an *Oligarchy*, an *Aristocracy*, a *Monarchy*, or a *Republic*, it will not matter to them, they will not quarrel about words; they want liberty, **AND LIBERTY THEY WILL HAVE**, *cost them what it may.*

Some of the members of your august assembly have appeared offended that the popular leaders should be *poor* and *ignorant*—my lords, it is not their fault, that the *tax-gatherer* has eat up their small estates, and reduced them to beggary. But that they are *ignorant*, may admit of some doubt. At all events they seem very sensible of their misfortunes; and they seem capable of bewailing them rather eloquently. Men who can perceive at a glance the extent of their misfortunes, penetrate into their most distant causes, trace the tortuous mazes of their oppressors' track, and point out the proper and equal remedy with the utmost precision, cannot be very ignorant; they cannot be the despicable demagogues they have been represented to be.


My lords, you possess learning, and genius, and fortune—add but to those fine qualities the virtues of a patriot; come forward and shield the people from oppression, they will be grateful, they will bless your names, and future ages shall record with pleasure the praises of a Grey, a Holland, and an Erskine.

I remain, my lords,

With the most profound respect,

Your Lordships' Fellow-Citizen,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.





**CORRESPONDENCE between Mr. MAULE  
and Mr. CARLILE.**

---

*Dorchester Gaol, Nov. 24, 1819.*

SIR,

In consequence of the seizure of all my property in Fleet Street, and the total stop put to my business, I am under the necessity of applying to you for support during my imprisonment, trusting that you will make this application known in the proper quarter.

I am, Sir,

*George Maule, Esq.  
Solicitor to the Treasury.*

Your obedient Servant,  
**RICHARD CARLILE.**

---

*Lincoln's Inn, Dec. 8, 1819.*

SIR,

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th ult. applying to me for support during your imprisonment, which I communicated to the proper quarter pursuant to your request.

I have now to acquaint you, that there does not appear to be any ground upon which your application can properly be complied with.

I am, Sir,

*Mr. Richard Carlile,  
Dorchester Gaol.*

Your obedient, humble Servant,  
**GEORGE MAULE.**

---

*Dorchester Gaol, Dec. 14, 1819.*

SIR,

I have received your answer to my application for support during my imprisonment, wherein you state, that there does not appear to be any ground upon which that application can properly be complied with. I will repeat to you more explicitly what I consider proper grounds for a compliance with that request. I am found guilty of publishing what you and your employers call a blasphemous libel, if any other person can define what a *blasphemous libel* is. The judges of the holy tribunal sentence me to three years' imprisonment, and mulct me in the sum of £1500. A

writ of *levari facias*, (which was never issued in a case of libel before,) is here immediately issued, which I have no doubt was ready signed and dried before the sentence was passed, as Mr. Sheriff Rothwell, and Mr. Turner, the under-sheriff, were actually in court waiting to receive it as soon as the judge had uttered his sentence; every tittle of my property, to the amount of £2000 if fairly sold in the shop, is seized, the shop shut up, and a business which at the time of its stopping was producing an average profit of £50 per week, is entirely put a stop to. Here sir, you have not only seized my property, but you have taken possession of the house, and prevented my family from proceeding in the same or any other business, and we are left to perish for what you and your coadjutors care, for want of the necessaries of life. Nothing can afford a stronger proof of the servility of the judges of the holy tribunal, alias Court of King's Bench, to the present administration, than my case; it must be visible to the dullest capacity, that they were directed in their sentence both as to imprisonment and fine. So, sir, you perceive, and I doubt not intended, that it should be so, that I am not only imprisoned for three years, but am to a certainty imprisoned as long as the present system of government continues, as you have not only obtained the infliction of a heavy fine, but at the same time have taken steps to prevent the payment of that fine, with an ultimate intention of keeping me in prison whilst your employers can keep their places. I know you sufficiently to expect that you will smile at my observations and present condition, but let me beg leave to predict, that like PRYNNE, BASTWICK, BURTON, LILBURNE and LEIGHTON, in the time of Charles the First, I shall obtain a reversal of the judgment against me, and the full amount of all damages I shall sustain either in person or property, and preserve my ears to the bargain. These are the grounds I have to remind you of, which I conceive would be sufficient if justice or humanity were in the question.

I am, Sir,

George Maule, Esq.  
Solicitor to the Treasury.

Your obedient Servant,  
RICHARD CARLILE.



## IN THE KING'S BENCH,

THE KING *against* RICHARD CARLILE, *on an* INFORMATION *for* LIBEL.

Richard Carlile, the defendant above named, maketh oath and saith, that this Information was filed in this Court against this deponent by his Majesty's late Attorney General, Sir Samuel Shepherd, Knight, charging him with having maliciously published a blasphemous libel, entitled the Theological Works of Thomas Paine; that on the twelfth day of October last, this Information was called on for trial and prosecuted by his Majesty's present Attorney General, Sir Robert Gifford, Knight, before the Lord Chief Justice of this court and a special jury. That deponent verily believes the proceedings in the course of this trial were irregular, and not according to law, and that the verdict, which was a verdict of guilty, was hereby contaminated.

And saith, that deponent, before the jury were sworn for this trial, protested against the authority of this Court to try the charge of blasphemy, inasmuch as there was no law applicable to the case, and that it was no offence against the laws of this country, there being no person defamed, or even charged on the record to be defamed, which deponent believes to be necessary to support the charge of libel agreeable to the laws of this country; and saith, that the strongest charge in the aforesaid information was, that this deponent had incurred the "high displeasure of Almighty God," no proof of which was offered to the court or jury, by the said Attorney General.

And saith, that during this trial the Court was twice adjourned, namely, on the evenings of the twelfth and thirteenth days of October aforesaid, and that the jurors did separate without the consent of this deponent, which was contrary to the laws of this country, and to the great injury of this deponent. And saith, that the jurors in this case were not nominated agreeably to the rule of this Court and the statute in that case made and provided, both of which ordain that forty eight free and lawful men should be nominated, whereas John Phillips, late of Cullum Street, Merchant, who was nominated as one of this deponent's jurors, and left on the list when reduced to twenty four, had been dead upwards of one and near two years.

And saith, that deponent has been informed and verily believes, that William Aldersey, of Token-house Yard, Mer-

chant, who also remained as one of the twenty-four jurors on this information, was never summoned to attend, by which this deponent was deprived of the benefit of two special jurors.

And saith, that deponent in the course of his trial was prevented by the undue interposition of the Lord Chief Justice, in making his defence, and proving to the jury, that this deponent's intention was good, (and not wicked and malicious as charged in the information;) by shewing the truth and moral tendency of the book, which this deponent admitted to have published. And saith, that on the second day of the trial, whenever this deponent introduced any thing that was a true and good defence, he was interrupted, and whilst he proceeded on matter that was not strictly relevant he was allowed to proceed, and the Court remained silent.

And saith, that this deponent had subpoenaed several eminent men, amongst others the Archbishop of Canterbury, the High Priest of the Jews, and the Astronomer Royal, with the most eminent men in each christian sect, to shew to the jury, that christianity could not be part of the law of the land, as christianity could not possibly be defined, and that no man could possibly say what it really was, without finding his opinions opposed by some other person. And that the Chief Justice of this Court denied this deponent the benefit of these important evidences, and continued to urge to the jury that christianity was part of the law of the land, and refusing to say to what species of christianity his lordship alluded, and silencing every request of that nature on the part of this deponent. And further saith, that contrary to the law of this country, which makes the jury judges of the law as well as of the fact, when the jury having retired for some time to consider their verdict, they (the jury) did send into Court requesting that two statutes, which deponent had referred to, should be sent to them, the Lord Chief Justice did hesitate to send the statutes agreeable to the request of the jury, and ordered the jury to be brought back into court, before his lordship allowed them to see the statutes required, when his lordship renewed his address to them for several minutes, which deponent verily believes was to his great injury, and not a just exposition of the law, nor required in this case, as the information was not founded on any statute.

**RICHARD CARLILE.**

*Sworn in open Court,  
this 9th day of November, 1819.*



## REASONS OF A DEIST,

*Why no Punishment should be Inflicted:*

MY LORDS,

Called upon at this time to answer if I have any reasons to offer why judgment should not be passed against me,

Permit me, my lords, to reply, that I have been guilty of no crime; no crime, at least, for which, consistently with the principles of justice, I ought to be made answerable before a human tribunal.

I cannot now hope to set aside the verdict, which *I believe* to have been wrongfully given against me; but as yet the evil is not complete; I have suffered unjust imprisonment; but by your judgment, at this time, some amends may be made for the injustice I have sustained. I have been found guilty of publishing Paine's *Age of Reason*. I contend, my lords, that in so doing there is no crime.

I fear you think otherwise, bear with me while I state the grounds of my opinion.

My lords, justice is invariably the same, she does not change with time, she does not falter with alarm; she stands above the clouds, and with steady hand holds the balances, while storms and tempests play beneath her feet; and kingdoms and empires, which regard not her decrees, perish beneath her frown. Pause, my lords, before you consign me to a dungeon, or cast me forth to poverty and undeserved disgrace.

The objects of justice are the punishment of crimes and the reformation of the offender; in this we agree; but surely, I need not remind your lordships, that it is the *intention* which makes the crime. The distinctions between *murder*, *manslaughter*, *justifiable homicide*, and *accidental killing*, are well known, and have often been explained by your lordships; they are the principles of our revered common law, of that common law, under which you tell me I have been tried; apply these principles to the case of libel; your lordships *have applied them*. Upon every action for damages your lordships *have applied them*; you *have given* the principles of the common law, and of justice, full sway; you have told the jury, that if the matter be *true* it is *no libel*; you have told them that if it be false, but communicated with a good intention, there is no case for damages. *Falsehood and evil intent* united, are the only reasons for damages.

Apply the same principles, my lords, to the act with which I am charged.

It is the publication of a book stated to be scandalous and untrue. It does not respect the characters of individuals. Its scandal, or its untruth, can be known only by discussion; I have published it that it may be discussed; this prosecution is an attempt to put a stop to this discussion; it is an attempt to stop the progress of *truth*.

You have rightly told me, my lords, that the truth of the book which I have published cannot be tried by this Court. It is removed far beyond the reach of such tribunals. The decision of a jury cannot be final in such a case. The intention only remains for your consideration.

Upon this, my lords, I feel *entitled* to an immediate discharge. Not a particle of evidence has been produced to prove that I published Paine's *Age of Reason* with an *evil intent*. If then, my lords, you will allow that *I believe* this book to be *true*, that *I believe* it to be *important truth*, you must declare me *innocent*; you must declare me not only innocent, but worthy your praise; I have in my humble sphere endeavoured to promote the cause of *truth*. I claim this at your hands.

The nature of the subject can make no difference; it is only as you can charge *me* with having *wilfully* and *maliciously* circulated *falsehood*, that, in this case, I am a proper object of human punishment; and since no evil intention has been *proved* against me, in the sacred name of justice I demand to be *set free*.

I have one more topic to urge upon your lordships, and I have done. It is not because my opinions are *contrary* to your own, that they are therefore *wrong*. It is not because *you may think* them subversive of all human society, that they *deserve* to be *punished*; you will not *say so*; do not, my lords, act as if you *thought it*. A man may hold the doctrines of the right of resistance to established governments; of the want of obligation in an oath; of the falsehood of the scriptures; or the non-existence of a future state; and yet remain a loyal and obedient subject; he may be a man of his word; a humble worshipper of God, and regular in the discharge of all his duties as a man and a citizen; if, my lords, you could punish such a man for *his opinions* or the publication of his opinions, you would have beheaded a Russell; burned the martyrs; and poisoned a Socrates. You will tell



me, perhaps, that the *manner* in which the subjects you deem sacred have been discussed is objected to. You will say, that serious subjects have been assailed with low and vulgar ridicule; and that such a mode of attack upon such subjects is not to be tolerated.

Answer me, my lords, does not this remark indicate a weakness in your cause? Does it not intimate that you dread lest christianity should suffer in the conflict? And yet you say, that yours is the cause of truth.

MY LORDS,

“Great is truth and will prevail.”

All that I demand is, a free and a fair trial for it; a trial in which the odds shall be less unequal than at present, a dungeon and a mitre.

Beware, my lords, how you hinder the progress of truth, by artificial mounds of your erection, and by limiting its flow, are found supporting errors, and disseminating moral danger, and moral death.

Truth will prevail, and the multitude of antient prejudices heaped against it, the more omnipotent will it appear. The gathering waters may be put within the mountains, but when they sufficiently accumulate; they will force themselves a passage and rush down upon the plain. If my opinions are of men, they must come to nought, but take heed, my lords, lest haply ye be found fighting against God.

My lords, if christianity be true, this prosecution is a libel upon its *truth*; the individuals who have prosecuted me, have misunderstood its nature; they seem to have supposed, that like the religion of Mahomet, it may be propagated by force; they have forgotten, that it is said, of that Jesus whom they call its author, that he declared “my kingdom is not of this world;” that when one of his disciples drew his sword and smote one that was sent to apprehend him, and cut off his ear, in defence of that kingdom, that he commanded, “put up thy sword, into its place, for they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword.” They seem to have forgotten that their apostle Paul has said, “the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.” My lords, is this true? Are these the principles of christianity? What can be more opposed to its propagation and defence by *force*, by *dungeons*, and by *fires*.

My lords, I am a Briton, and if, as it is boasted, Christianity is part and parcel of the common law of the land, I claim my interest in the protection it may chance to afford.—Shew, my lords, that it contains the principles you profess. The individuals who have promoted this prosecution call the Inquisition, Antichristian;—they see the mote which is in their brother's eye, but consider not the beam that is in their own eye. They forget that under what they call a brighter day, they are antichristian too; and that to the utmost of their power they display, *this day*, the spirit which would kindle the flames of Smithfield; and illuminate our minds by the burning bodies of our brethren.

My lords, if you refuse to allow me full credit for the purity of my intentions, you will, at this day, give your sanction to the unjust crucifixion of him whom you call Master and Lord; and declare that you have no regard to the principles of Eternal Justice. If, my lords, you consign me to a dungeon, or load me with fines, you will practically proclaim that you believe *Jesus* to be a *cheat*, and *Saint Paul* to be a *liar*.

Therefore, my lords, expect, that if you *act* upon the principles of Justice or Religion, you will command me *to be set free*.

In arrest and in bar, therefore, of the judgment of this Court, without intending any personal disrespect to the several judges composing the same, I utterly deny, that I am in any degree amenable or accountable to this court or to any human tribunal, for any opinions on theological subjects, for publishing which, I have been unjustly convicted by a jury as matter of criminal libel; contrary to all the definitions of libel, to be found in the records of the laws of England. I also utterly deny the competency and authority of this court and jury, before whom it was pretended to try such questions; and if this court, without the sanction of any statute law, and in defiance of that reason, justice, and common sense, on which the common law of England is founded, choose to continue to assert itself to be a tribunal of the nature of the abhorred inquisition of Spain, and Portugal, and persist in passing a vindictive sentence against me; then it remains for me to submit with the fortitude of a martyr



to such injustice and cruelty, and, as my last resource, to protest in the name of the injured laws and constitution of my country, against the whole of these oppressive proceedings, in the sixteen following reasons.

1. Because, no man can in justice be made criminally answerable for mere abstract opinions, which result from the honest convictions of his reason.

2. Because, the publication of opinions on abstract, scientific, and speculative subjects, is no criminal libel, breach of the peace, or social crime; but is a duty which every honest man is bound to perform, that if true they may be adopted, and if false may be refuted.

3. Because, no opinions can be exceptions to the preceding rule, for if it be said that certain doctrines are from God, and ought therefore not to be disputed, it is evident that doctrines which emanate from an all-powerful deity, cannot be shaken or overturned by man, and therefore the publication of any adverse opinions of man, must necessarily be harmless.

4. Because, it is evident, that the employment of the force of law, which implies the civil and military power of the state, to maintain opinions, affords a demonstrative proof, that those who resort to this weapon, well know their opinions to be false, are conscious that they are not upheld by God, and feel that they cannot be defended by reason, and will not be supported by the irresistible and omnipotent power of God.

5. Because, on matters of religion there can be no standard of truth, but human reason, or the alledged operations of the spirit of God, and conviction is the result of either or both; and this result, as a natural or supernatural effect, is a question between a man and his own powers of reason or between a man and his God, and not cognizable by any other man, or by any human tribunal.

6. Because, the very attempt making on this occasion to render a court of law, or mere human tribunal, the standard of theological opinions, has led to all the wicked, bloody, and disgraceful martyrdoms, which stain the pages of history; and at which, every succeeding age blushes for the errors, absurdities, and crimes, of the preceding age.

7. Because, if the present erroneous, persecuting

vindictive, and intolerant proceedings were to lead to the cruel punishment of my body, the proceedings of this court and all concerned in them, would be viewed by sensible, just, and liberal men in this age, and by all men in future ages, with the same abhorrence as we hold the courts of Inquisition, and all the courts of tyrants and barbarous times, in which similar martyrdoms have been perpetrated.

8. Because, it is not only wicked and blasphemous, but absurd and unjust, for any man to set up his opinion as a standard of theological faith for any other man; I have avowed myself a Deist, or a believer in one eternal and omnipotent God, and in the social principles, that virtue is its own reward; a belief in which I feel with due reverence, and a principle which I endeavour to practice in all the relations of life; and I solemnly call on all other men, and on those composing this tribunal, whatever be their faith, as they respect the power and competency of God to affect all mens' minds with all-desirable truth, not to be parties in this persecution, or in any vindictive punishment.

9. Because, it has been invariably found, that where the mind has had its free exercise, mankind have founded different points of faith on the same system of religion; and that such variation arises from the varied dispositions of men, and argues strongly the absurdity of restraint, or of legislating on matters of opinion.

(To be Continued )

### **SUBSCRIPTION for MRS. CARLILE.**

*These are the times to try men's souls.*

A Meeting will be held in the course of a few days for the purpose of appointing a general meeting in order to promote a subscription for the benefit of Mrs. Carlile and three young children; all her property having been seized by the crown for Mr. Carlile's fine, at a time too when Mrs. C. was far advanced in a state of pregnancy.

In the mean time subscriptions will be most thankfully received by Mr. Fisher, at the Statesman office, 194, Strand; by Mr. Davison, publisher of the Republican, Duke street, Smithfield; or by Mrs. Carlile, 55, Fleet street, (*private door.*)